Conversation Analysis and the study of bilingual interaction

Jakob Steensig
Aarhus University

1. Introduction

This paper is written by a linguist who is working with language in interaction within the paradigm of Conversation Analysis. It contains deliberations about how Conversation Analysis can contribute to the study of bilingual interaction.

Some years ago I participated in a seminar where the socalled Køge Project researchers, who investigate Turkish-Danish bilingual students in Denmark, invited researchers with different backgrounds and approaches to work on data from the Køge Project corpus (see Holmen & Jørgensen (eds.) 2000). At the Tromsø Conference on Scandinavian Linguistics, January 2002, Jens Normann Jørgensen arranged a follow up workshop where a smaller group of researchers continued their work with the Køge Project data and similar data. For that occasion I decided to focus on methodological problems and advantages of doing Conversation Analysis on bilingual data. This article is a revised version of my contribution to the Tromsø seminar (Steensig 2001c).[1] I shall stress that the following notes are my personal views and experiences.

In the following, I will say a few words about the fields of "Conversation Analysis" and "the study of bilingual interaction" and sum up the methodological lessons from my earlier analyses of the Køge data. Then I will proceed to showing some aspects of conversation-analytical methodology through concrete analyses of extracts from the Køge Project data.

2. Conversation Analysis and the study of bilingual interaction

Conversation Analysis is a set of methods and a certain analytic mentality for studying talk-in-interaction, often associated with the names of its founder, Harvey Sacks, and his co-workers, Gail Jefferson and Emanuel Schegloff (for a concise introduction to the methodology, see Heritage 1984). The methodology has been around for nearly 4 decades and has gained insight into many facets of language as used in verbal interaction, but

---

most analyses within this framework have been carried out on monolingual, most often Anglo-European, language material.

In speaking about Conversation Analysis, I refer to analyses carried out with the methodology and mentality of this approach. It is possible to apply parts of the terminology and methodology without trying to adhere to the principles of Conversation Analysis. Such "use" of conversation-analytical bits and pieces can be warranted and useful, but this is not what I am writing about here.

The study of bilingual interaction is not one method but rather a topic, a certain area of language use, which is approached in methodologically very diverse ways. By the term "bilingual interaction," I mean to include both studies of interaction containing code-switching (as, e.g., in Auer (ed.) 1998 or in the Køge Project) and studies of other interaction where bilinguals take part or where more languages are in other ways involved (as, e.g., in the case of "crossing," Rampton 1995).

Common to Conversation Analysis and the study of bilingual interaction is that both rely on interactional data, and that within both fields there is an interest in social aspects of language use. The type of data used are, however, slightly different. Conversation Analysis only uses data from recordings of situations in people's daily lives where nothing has been done to favour certain types of behaviour or otherwise experimentally control what is going on. Researchers of bilingual interaction use such data as well, but they also use elicited data of various kinds and combine the study of those with anthropological and sociometric methods, and, on occasions, also with linguistic tests of different kinds.

Conversation Analysis has a specific system and tradition for the transcription of data, which aims at a high level of detail in rendering the timing and (certain) pronunciational particulars. Bilingual data are transcribed in a number of ways, according to the purpose and beliefs of the researchers in every case. Often, there is less emphasis on timing matters and more on codability and grammatical analysis.

Some researchers in the study of bilingual interaction have a top-down approach to data. By this I mean that a researcher comes to the data with a specific question in mind (a hypothesis of sorts) and then uses the data to answer the question. In Conversation Analysis, as in some of the more qualitative approaches to the study of bilingual interaction, the questions are formulated through analyses of the data, i.e., a bottom-up approach is used. Furthermore, conversation analysts tend to be very sceptical about preconceived analytical notions, as for instance when categorisation of speakers according to ethnic or sociological criteria is used a resource for the analysis. Conversation Analysis aims at finding such categories *in the data*,

and to show that the categories are relevant to the participants in the interaction.

In line with the bottom-up approach of Conversation Analysis, this presentation will use transcribed conversational data as its point of departure.

3. The data and some earlier work

The data used for this presentation are from "Conversation 801" of the Køge data corpus (see Holmen & Jørgensen (eds.) 2000; Turan (ed.) 1999). It is an audio-taped conversation where four Turkish-Danish bilingual 8th grade students (around 14 years of age) are sitting in a little room at school performing a task where they have to cut out pictures from magazines, glue them onto a poster, and make a story about the pictures.

Steensig (2000a) is a short analysis of a little extract form conversation 801, based on a retranscription of parts of the conversation in the conversation-analytical style. Some of the main methodological points from that analysis were:

1. A conversation-analytical transcription (or another type which is equally detailed) is necessary to spot details which are important for the understanding of code-switches and the negotiation of roles and relations. I shall not discuss the issue of transcription further here, but I use the conversation-analytical transcription method below, and to the extent that my analysis yields new insights, this is partly due to the choice of transcription style. In the appendix, there is a legend to the transcription conventions.

2. A detailed analysis of what it is relevant for every participant to do at specific points in the interaction is crucial to the understanding of the context in which events as, e.g., code-switches, take place.

3. Conversation-analytical methods can help in understanding how participants make alliances and "power wielding" in the interaction (Jørgensen 1998). Although this point was only cursorily developed in Steensig (2000a) it was claimed that detailed analyses using conversation-analytical methods may be a clue to a better understanding of the social relations between the participants.

In the exposition below I start with a short extract from the data I analysed in Steensig (2000a). This time I dig deeper into how the analysis is made. I use a step-by-step procedure which involves a preliminary characterization of actions, a sequence analysis, an analysis of turn construction and turn-taking, and an analysis of social relations (for a similar procedure, see Pomerantz & Fehr 1997).

Having done this, I return to some of the issues treated in the Holmen & Jørgensen (eds.) (2000) volume to see if conversation-analytical methods as we now see them can contribute to dealing with some of these issues.

4. Step-by-step analysis

I shall start with a short extract of what was also analysed in Steensig (2000a):[2]

Extract 1. [Køgedata:Conv801:retr.11/01:8 – 2.20 min]

```
 1 ESEN:   Jeg [har en] ide,=Vil I gerne hø:re det.
   eng:    I   [have an] idea,=Would you(PLUR) like to hear it.
 2 EROL:       [(nu,) ]
   eng:         (now)
   com:    ((first 4 words spoken enthusiastically))

 3 pause:  (0.8)

 4 ESEN:   Altså en ide:.
   eng:    you know an idea
   com:    ((distinct, calm voice))

 5 pause:  (0.3)

 6 SELMA:  Ne[j vi vil ikk'[ hø:re] det,    ]
   eng:      N[o we will not [  hear] it,       ]
            N[o we don't want[ to hear] it,       ]
 7 ASIYE:     [Det kommer an[ på  ]hva' det]er]
   eng:        It depends    [ on   ]what it ]is ]
 8 ESEN:                      [    Di]nle    E]r ]ol,Dinle.=
   eng:                            Listen(SING) Erol, Listen
   com:    ((all three talk calmly))

 9 EROL:   =Tamam Bakıyorum.
   eng:     Right  I'm-looking
   com:    ((calm, friendly voice))
```

5. Preliminary characterisation of actions

Conversation analysts often start off by trying to establish what actions are being carried out by the participants. The purpose is not to make a complete analysis of "speech acts" or the like; rather, a preliminary description of actions is seen as a good point of departure for the analysis of the interaction.

I hear Esen's first utterance in line 1 as an announcement of a proposal, followed by a request to get attention to present the proposal. In line 4 Esen restates the announcement. In line 6 Selma declines the request and in line 7 Asiye accepts it, but in a strongly conditioned fashion. In line 8 Esen reissues her request, but this time addresses one participant, the one who has not yet

---

[2] For transcription conventions, see the appendix.

reacted to her first initiatives, i.e., Erol. Finally, in line 9, Erol seems to accept the request. Or, schematically:

```
Extract  1.  Fig.  1
   Ln.  1: announcement of a proposal + request for attention
   Ln.  4: Restatement of announcement
   Ln.  6: Rejection of request
   Ln.  7: Strongly conditioned acceptance of request
   Ln.  8: Reissue of request
   Ln.  9: Acceptance of request
```

6. Sequential structure

Conversation analysts stress that utterances in interaction are not just single events but are connected. They are part of a web of meanings created as *inter*-action, where every utterance can be seen as shaped by, and as an analysis of, the interaction so far. Simultaneously, the utterance creates a new context for the subsequent utterances (Heritage 1984). One way of grasping this feature of the interaction is through an analysis of the *sequential structure*.

To get a view of the sequential structure of this particular extract, we need to characterise the actions in terms of what they do to the progression of the interaction. This is done in the left part of the figure below:

```
Extract  1.  Fig.  2
1-4 Esen  Req. f. attention + announcem.--REQUEST
                                          |-----PRE-SEQUENCE
                                          |         |
6    Selma Rejection---------------------REJECTION--ABORT SEQ.

8    Esen  Reissue of request-------------REQUEST
                                          |-----PRE-SEQUENCE
9    Erol  Acceptance---------------------ACCEPTANCE  |
                                                CONTINUE SEQ.
```

Together lines 1-4 form a request where the relevant responses are acceptance or rejection. But this request can also be seen as a preface to a larger project, in this case a presentation of an idea. It resembles "story prefaces" (Sacks 1992b: 157-87; Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998: 134-37) or "pre-announcements" (Terasaki 1976; Levinson 1983: 345-64), i.e., an utterance which states that the speaker is going to tell a story or make an announcement, and solicits a response where co-participants show if they are willing to become story or announcement recipients. The continuation to the next step is contingent on a "willingness" or "go ahead" response, i.e., an acceptance of the request in this case. So, the sequence which has begun in line 1 and has been restarted in line 4 is a request making an acceptance

relevant, and, this request-acceptance sequence is itself a "pre-sequence" to a presentation.

Selma's response is a clear rejection, and would seem to forestall any continuation. Asiye's line 7 is a conditional acceptance, not showing any clear willingness, and thus not a clear "go ahead" response either (which is why it has been excluded from the schematical figure above).

In line 8 Esen reissues her request and in line 9 it is accepted by Erol. This seems to make it possible to go through with the project which Esen announced already in the beginning, i.e., the sequence projected by the pre-sequence can (and does) start after this.

The above characterisations of actions and sequential structure will enter into a more detailed description of how the actions are performed through turns-at-talk, i.e., what conversation analysts think of as "turn construction."

7. Turn construction and the game of "give and take"

When people interact verbally, they take turns. The shape of an utterance at any given point in time can show ("project") what it will take for an ongoing utterance to reach a point where others can take a turn, and linguistic means seem designed for such turn-taking (or turn allocation) purposes (see Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974; Schegloff 1996; Steensig 2001a). Conversation analysts have found that detailed attention to turn construction and turn allocation can give insights into both linguistic and sociological factors of the interaction, which in turn can throw light also on the conditions for the alternate use of languages in bilingual interaction.

The following sketches how the turns are constructed, and, subsequently, how participants pay attention to the linguistic shape of utterances as the interaction unfolds:

In line 1 the presentation of the idea (*Jeg har en ide*, 'I have an idea') is done in a declarative format and in an enthusiastic voice.[3] After these first four words, a possible syntactic completion has been reached, and already here the utterance could be a complete proposal to which recipients could show their willingness to listen, e.g., by saying *What/Oh/What's that/Really/Do you/Let's hear*, etc. Esen does not, however, await any response, she immediately produces her direct request (*Vil I gerne høre det*, 'Would you like to hear it'). This is an interrogative yes/no question, produced in a calmer voice than the beginning. The addressing word, *I*, is in the plural, i.e., Esen directs her request to more than one of the others. Now

---

[3] Lay terminology is used here to describe voice quality. This usage is warranted, I believe, as long as it is possible for others to listen to and agree on the descriptions. The transcript is never primary data in Conversation Analysis and the sound should always be available for inspection.

the request is more direct and the array of possible "go ahead responses" consequently limited to some positive response token, like *Yes/Sure/Mhm*.

The lack of response in line 3 already opens up for an interpretation as unwillingness. Not because a lack of response is always indicative of unwillingness, but because there seems to be an inbuilt sequential orientation that after requests with a clear preference for a positive answer, a lack of response is seen by participants as "on its way to" a negative answer. This orientation is built on two observations: (1) that positive answers in such contexts most often are done without delays whereas negative answers are delayed, and (2) that first speakers often modify their first requests when a positive answer is not immediately forthcoming, in a way that softens the request, downgrades it, or otherwise makes it less easily rejectable (Pomerantz 1984a, 1984b; Sacks 1987; Heritage 1984; Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998: 43-37).

The expansion which Esen makes in line 4 can now be seen as specifically produced after a lack of response, but before the absence of such response becomes dramatically noticeable. It has been proposed for English ordinary conversations that there is a "standard maximum silence" of around 1 second (Jefferson 1989), after which the silence regularly gets noted and is treated as problematic. In my experience this is true for Danish everyday interaction as well, and it may be operative in this conversation too, although it is impossible to conclude anything definite about this because of the lack of visual data.[4]

Syntactically, line 4 (*Altså en ide*, 'you know an idea') is an expansion of line 1. Following, 'would you like to hear it,' it can be seen as making it explicit (again) that the project Esen is pursuing is the presentation of 'an idea.' After the last word a new point of possible completion has been reached. Now, there's a short silence (0.3 seconds) possibly again indicating lack of willingness from the other parties.

Selma and Asiye start responding (lines 6-7) almost simultaneously. A short time after they have started talking in overlap, Esen jumps in and starts talking too (line 8). In Steensig (2000a) I argued that the overlapping utterances are very closely coordinated, and that the actual formulations chosen, including the code-switch to Turkish in line 8, are based on close attention to turn-design, turn-taking and participation framework. This argumentation is central to my considerations about the usefulness of conversation-analytical methods, and, therefore, I shall repeat some of it here with a focus on methodological issues:

---

[4] Silences in face-to-face interaction can be occupied by relevant physical activities, in which case they are not breaks in the flow of interaction at all.

Line 6 consists of two parts, a *Nej* ('no') plus an explicit rejection, *vi vil ikk' høre det* ('we don't want to hear it'). The *nej* does not seem to be constructed to stand alone, it has no independent stress and the string, *nej vi vil ikk'*, is spoken as one unit. The rejection is constructed by reusing Esen's words from line 1, *Vil I gerne høre det*, with only the syntactic changes needed to turn it into a declarative clause and to change the subject of the clause, plus a replacement of the softening adverbial *gerne* (literally, 'willingly') with the negation, *ikk'*.

Asiye's line 7 starts after Selma has pronounced the beginning of the word *nej* ('no'). When Asiye starts speaking enough of this word has been pronounced for Asiye to be able to hear that this is what is being produced. This means that Asiye can design her own utterance knowing what Selma is going to say.[5] Line 7 begins with *det kommer an* ('it depends'). In Danish this can not be a clause on its own but projects a complement stating the condition on which 'it depends,' where *på* ('on') is the required preposition and *hva' det er* ('what it is') is a more or less predictable complement, given the situation.

When Esen starts speaking, she is in an even better position. At this point she has heard enough of both Selma's and Asiye's utterances to be able to know not only which actions they are performing, but also how they are doing this. Esen knows that Selma and Asiye are not going to act as recipients to her proposal, so she can turn to the fourth and last participant, Erol, and use whatever means she has available to get his attention and acceptance. One of the means she uses, is her switch to the other language, Turkish. Another is the singling out of the recipient, firstly, through the use of an imperative in the singular, secondly, through using the name of the recipient, and, thirdly, through repeating the imperative. Note, that this repetition also secures that Esen gets the last word and that her request ('listen') gets heard in the clear after the overlap (for the use of repetitions and other means for dealing with overlapping talk, see Schegloff 1987, 2000).

Erol's reply (line 9) consists of an acceptance token + a reassuring statement. This part is also in Turkish. Erol's reply is affirmative in content, but also in design; it comes without the slightest hesitance and it aligns with Esen's request in choosing the same language.

The above account should have shown how participants produce their contributions in ways which are sensitive to what is happening here and now in the interaction and in ways which contribute to -- and reflect the nature of

---

[5] For an argumentation that it is possible for Asiye to hear and react to such a little token, see Steensig (2000a:17). A general argumentation for this sort of possibility can be found in Jefferson (1984, 1986) and Sacks (1992a:11).

-- the projects they are pursuing. Here, code-switching is one aspect of this sensitivity.

8. Social relations in action

The Køge project researchers have followed the four participants in this conversation (and other bi- and monolingual students) through their entire school carreer, and have been able to draw very elaborate portraits of the students, their developing linguistic skills, their identity formation, and their relations to each other (e.g., Jørgensen 1993, 1998; Holmen & Jørgensen 2000; Møller 1998; Maegaard 1998). Conversation Analysis can contribute to the study of such factors, mainly through showing *how* social relations etc. are created, re-created, and maintained *in interaction.*

I'll start by making a few notes on what can be inferred about social relations in extract 1:

By saying, *Jeg har en ide* (line 1), Esen implies that it is relevant to present an idea, and the shortness of the utterance could also imply that Esen considers herself entitled to present ideas and assumes that the others will understand enough about what sort of idea it is to see its relevance.

Her entitlement can, of course, be assumed to be effective as a result of the setting; the participants are gathered to glue pictures onto a poster and make a story. But conversation analysts want to be able to show *in the data* what kind of entitlements, rights, obligations and relations are at work.

Extract 1 starts 2:15 minutes into the recording, and at this point Esen has already several times tried to get the others involved in deciding what they should do.[6] However, a short look at the interaction immediately prior to extract 1, reveals that the fact that Esen is the central figure in the task-related talk here, has been brought about through the participants' actions. We enter at a point where Esen has told a story, there is some laughter and an outburst of sorts from Erol:

Extract 2. [Køgedata:Conv801:retr.11/01:7 – 2.00 min]

```
 1 EROL:   =hvor[er den sej,] üç da[kikada:,]
   eng:     how [is it cool  ]three [minute-in]
            how [cool it is   ]in thre[e minutes ]
 2 ESEN?:       [↑hnhh hnhh↑] ↑hnhh[          ]
 3 SELMA:                          [  Esen, ]=

 4 GIRL:   =°hm.°
```

```
 5  ESEN:   ·hh↑hn̲hhh ↑(la væ̲r og fortæ̲l,)⁷
    eng:                  (don't tell)

 6  EROL:   U̲mf:. E̲sen, Kro̲pa bak,
    eng:    U̲mf:. E̲sen, body-at look
                  Umf:.  Esen,  look at the body

 7  SELMA:  Aj >E̲sen< O̲ss' (de̲n der),
    eng:    Oh Esen Also (this one)
```

We do not know exactly what Erol is talking about in line 1, or whom his talk is directed to. But after this it is evident that both Selma (lines 3 and 7) and Erol (line 6) address their talk to Esen, and that Esen does not do such addressing work (whatever else it is that she is doing).

The "pointing" and attention-requesting activities of Erol and Selma seem to move the focus back to task-related matters, from a non-task related story that Esen has told, but, apparently, they need Esen's approval to do this. The local reason for this may be that Esen has just been the centre of attention -- *qua* story-teller -- and there is a tendency that interactants "talk back to" prior speakers (see Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974: 708, on the "bias for prior as next speaker").

The focus on taks-related matters and the fact that Esen is the centre of attention at the beginning of extract 1, is, thus, something that has come about as a result of work done by mainly Erol and Selma in extract 2.

In extract 1, however, Asiye and Selma seem to resist Esen's move into the presentation of the "idea" (lines 6 and 7 in extract 1). So, it is not the case that Esen is the permanent leader, or always in control. She clearly has to fight to get her line through. What we can see her do, however, is use the devices she has available very skillfully. She switches language, she reshapes her actions, she readdresses her initiatives, and through these practices she manages to become the centre of the talk and the task-related work over and over again.

9. Relations to the study of bilingual interaction

This tiny bit of interaction has shown us some means which participants use in interaction, including the use of code-switching as a resource. But what use can this type of analysis be to the study of code-switching and bilingual interaction more generally?

I shall address a few of the points mentioned in earlier studies, *viz.*, the linguistic context of code-switches, functional motivations for code-switching, addressing and attention-getting devices, and the monolingual story-line.

---

[7] Another possible hearing is *var ve̲' og gå ti̲l* ('was almost getting destroyed').

10. The linguistic context of code-switches

Backus (2000) focusses on different types of code-switching, where one type has a clear base in one language into which short extracts from the other language are inserted, whereas the other, more integrated, type is like a true "bilingual code" with frequent and bi-directional switches. In determining the types in the data, one step can be to localize the exact linguistic context of a switch, ie., whether it is an intra-word, intra-sentential, inter-sentential, or inter-turn switch.

As mentioned before, the detailed transcription and micro-analysis of what happens can qualify the description of the environment in which code-switches occur. In extract 1, we saw that the first switch in line 8 occurred after a series of attempts at getting a response, and we caught a glimpse of how it was designed to occur in -- and to get out of -- an overlap. As mentioned in Steensig (2000a), a transcript that emphasizes exact timing etc. will help the analyst capture particulars of this sort, and exactly such particulars may be systematically consequential for the language choice of the participants at any given moment.

There is no doubt that the code-switch in extract 1 is an inter-turn one. And there is no doubt either that the use of the Danish word *krop* ('body') in an otherwise Turkish construction in extract 2, line 6, "Esen, *krop*a bak," is an intra-lexical alternation. This would also be transparent in a much cruder transcript, but in Steensig (2000a) I mentioned a case where something which was in an earlier transcript noted as one continuous utterance with a language alternation inside it, turned out to be several turns with other things happening in between the switches, ie. not *intra-* but *inter-*turn switches.

In order to explore this a little more, I look at a few other extracts from Conversation 801 where participants make intra-sentential alternations. There are a few of these a little later in the conversation, after the participants have started discussing the details of the story and the task:

Extract 3. [Køgedata:Conv801:retr.11/01:14 - 4.15 min]

```
 1 ESEN: Onu sonra kullanalım,=
   eng:  that later we-can-use
         we can use that later
```

```
 2 ESEN:   =Ogla[n     kıza ] fri  ]   ya[p°sın°]⁸
   eng:     boy [    to-girl] propose]he-can[do      ]
            The [boy can prop]ose to  ]the gi[rl     ]
 3 EROL:        [↓H*e dogru]valla ]dogru[         ]
   eng:           yeah right  Gosh   right [       ]
 4 GIRL:                                 [KHRHHH]=
   com:     ((Erol uses "dramatic," hoarse voice))

 5 GIRL:   =[KHRHH       KHRHH       ]
 6 EROL:    [Hemen yapıstır limleye] °eh-°⁹
   eng:      right-away glue  glue-VB       uh
             glue it right away, glue-  should we glue it uh
   com:     ((girl coughs rather loudly))

 7 EROL:   =limle↑ye[lim °mi°?      ]
   eng:     glue-VB- [let's QP¹⁰      ]
            let's glu[e it?           ]
 8 SELMA?         [(>Så gør det)]=
   eng:           (Then does it)
                  (Then it does)

 9 SELMA? =(jo ikk' noget [det v]ar<)=
   eng:     (   not matter  [it   w]as)
            (not matter if it[ was)  ]
10 GIRLa:                   [(Ej) ]
                            (No)

11 SELMA? =(↓tyr[kisk)  ]¹¹
   eng       (Tur[kish)
12 EROL:       [Ska' v]i lime den ↓hva'=
   eng:          should we glue it or-what
```

In line 2, Esen uses the Danish verb, *fri* ('propose') in a Turkish verbal construction with the general (auxiliary) verb *yapmak*, 'to do' (for the use of this construction in immigrant Turkish, see Türker 2001), rendering the meaning 'propose.' This construction, with an auxiliary verb in one language and a main verb in another, is interesting from a structural, linguistic point of view, but a conversation-analytical approach does not

---

⁸ The italicized '*g*' in Turkish (non-italicized) words replaces the Turkish "soft g" (graphically a 'g' with a little 'v' on top) which in these cases achieves a lengthening of the preceding vowel.

⁹ The italicized '*s*' in Turkish (non-italicized) words replaces the Turkish 's' with a little "cedille" on it. This letter is pronounced approximately as English 'sh.'

¹⁰ "VB" designates a Turkish verbalisation suffix, "QP" is the Turkish question particle.

¹¹ Originally, I heard this as something unintelligible + *nu v' jeg* ('now I want to'), but after having digitized and reheard, I now tend to hear what I have put here.

seem to have much to add to the analysis of the structural properties of this. The conversation-analytical approach can, however, still help with the precise description of the environment:

The construction in line 2 is used in a suggestion, and in an overlap situation, where the overlapping utterance does not seem to compete for the right to speak (Erol's line 3 seems to be accompanying rather than competing). Esen's utterance is spoken in one intonation contour, there is an emphasis on the Danish word, *fri*, and this word is clearly the most important part of what Esen is trying to say. Arguably, her utterance is understandable (ie. pragmatically complete, see also Steensig 2001a, 2001b) at the point when this word is spoken, even though it is not grammatically complete before the finite verb (*yapsın*) has been uttered.

The next intra-sentential switch occurs in extract 3, lines 6-7. First, Erol gives his suggestion using the Turkish verb "yapıştır-," '(to) glue.' Then he uses another verb meaning the same, this time one with a Danish stem, "*lim-*" ('glue'), plus a Turkish verbalisation suffix, "-le-," "*lim*le-." This word occurs frequently in the Køge data corpus, and it could be a more or less stable loan construction in these students' in-group language. The first occurrence of it in line 6 is prosodically integrated with what comes before it, but it has a clear and insisting stress, in contrast to the preceding Turkish version, "yapıştır-," which was unstressed. The word "*lim*leye" is not completed, it is followed by a short hesitation marker and a "cut off," and then it gets repeated (line 7) with a finite ending plus a question particle. [12] Erol reissues his suggestion a little later (line 12), and this time he does it in Danish.

We can note that the three tries by Erol exhibit a pattern where the first is in Turkish, the next is in Turkish with a "code-switched" verb, and the third is in Danish. This is in line with earlier observations from a range of code-switching contexts (cf. Auer 1998:4-5 and references herein): repeated actions after lack of uptake ('second attempts') are often loci of code-switches. Unfortunately, none of the suggestions get any audible uptake so it is not possible to use conversation-analytical methods to get more indications whether these code-switches are functionally "motivated."

In the parts of Conversation 801 which I have transcribed there is one further instance of intra-lexical and intra-sentential switching:

---

[12] This repetition of the verb and the repair may have to do with the fact that line 6 gets overlapped by rather loud coughing. At any rate, the result of what Erol does is that the verb containing the full suggestion comes after the end of the coughing.

Extract 4. [Køgedata:Conv801:retr.11/01:16 – 4.50 min]

```
 1 ESEN:  Den er lidt uhyggelig, så'[n lidt,]
   eng:    it is a-little scary     just [a-b     ]
 2 SELMA:                             [hnhfhh ]=

 3 SELMA: =Og så:-
   eng:    And then-

 4 pause: (1.0)

 5 SELMA: =£°frisørye gitsin°£ eHhghh< hehh ·hhh=
   eng:    hairdresser-to she-should-go
           she should go to hairdresser

 6 pause: (0.8)

 7 GIRL:  =e::[    ↓e]:: °hm°
 8 SELMA:     [°øh,°]

 9 pause: (1.0)

10 GIRL:   °(Det ka' vi godt,)°
   eng:     (We can do that)
   com:     ((spoken very unarticulated))
```

Selma makes a suggestion in lines 3-5. In the original transcript (Turan 1999: 213), this goes simply, "*og så frisør*ya gitsin."[13] From this, one gets the impression that this is a very fluent switch and that it is difficult to say which language is the "base" language here. This could be a good example of a "bilingual code" beginning in one language (Danish) and, apparently effortlessly, switching to the other (Turkish) in the middle of the utterance and in the middle of a word.

The conversation-analytical transcript, however, gives a different impression: After the Danish "*og så*" ('and then') there is a "cut off" and then a longish silence. When Selma speaks again her voice is soft and "smiling." She uses the Danish word "*frisør*" ('hairdresser') with a Turkish case suffix and in a Turkish syntactical frame (a Danish syntactical construction would have had the verb right after *så*: "*og så gik hun til frisøren*," literally, 'and then went she to the hairdresser'). So, there might actually be a change of "base" language here, from Danish in line 3 to Turkish in line 5. In any case, the "cut off," the silence, the change of voice

---

[13] I hear the suffix "-ye," the original transcriber heard "-ya." There is no difference in meaning as these are two versions of the same dative case suffix.

and the post-positioned laughter all contribute to a sense of "markedness" here, which the other instances did not have.

The marked character of Selma's talk at this point may be connected to the fact that this is a second try at making the suggestion. Some 15 seconds earlier Selma has made the same suggestion, but at that time it occurred in overlap and it did not get any response. Instead, a discussion between Esen and Erol ensued about whether or not a movie was scary or not. Selma's second try cuts into this discussion and attempts to go back to her own earlier suggestion. The code-switch may, thus, be part of an effort to get heard in a competitive situation, where the other pronunciational particulars may be other parts of that very same attempt.

11. Functional motivations for code-switching

Many accounts of bilingual talk distinguish between "functionally" or "pragmatically" motivated code-switches on one hand, and switches that happen without such motivation (e.g., as part of using a "bilingual code," triggered by a topic, or caused by the lack of a term in one language) on the other. Holmen & Jørgensen, for instance, state that "the code switching skills for *pragmatic purposes* seem to develop in different ways for the students" (2000: 144, emphasis added), assuming that such code-switching for pragmatic purposes can be distinguished from other types.

Can Conversation Analysis contribute to an understanding of the functionality of code-switching? There is no final answer to this, and the matter is complicated because conversation analysts have a conception of "motivation" and "intention" that differs radically from that of most pragmaticians. I am not going to address these rather complicated issues here (but see Heritage 1984; Steensig 2001a). Instead, I shall sum up where I think the above analytical sketches have brought us concerning the issue of functionality and add a few further deliberations.

There were instances where it could be argued that switching to another language could be part of interactional efforts, e.g., getting heard through overlap, getting attention, displaying affiliation, and making second suggestions. In such cases it would seem that Conversation Analysis can contribute to finding interactional functionality. There were, however, other instances where no obvious functions could be found, or where no kind of evidence was at hand to show possible functions.

Some of the instances of the latter type might be considered as falling into the realm of what Sacks referred to as the "poetics of ordinary talk" (1992b: 291-93, 305-9, 321-25, 396-401). Sacks observed occurrences such as "GOD Christmas has GOTten so damn painful" (1992b: 292) and noted that it may not be a coincidence that two words with the same sounds in them ("God" and "gotten") cooccur.

If a bilingual speaker has an inventory of words, including words from different languages, then "poetics" may be a factor which could account for some of the choices. There are no clear-cut cases in our examples, only one faint and "freaky" possibility:

In extract 4, we had Selma saying, "*Og så:- (1.0)* £°*frisør*ye gitsin°£." By choosing the Danish word "*frisør*" rather than a possible Turkish equivalent, *kuaför*, Selma gets two words with clear "i"-sounds in the first syllable, "*frisør*ye" and "gitsin."

Or we have sequences like,

Extract 5 [Køgedata:Conv801:retr.11/01:3-4]

```
1 ESEN:    Aj- Br[ug hovedet,]
  eng:    Oh- use[ your head   ]
2 SELMA:       [Büyük  °ols]un°.
  eng:           big it-must-be
                 It must be big
```

In line 2 Selma chooses Turkish and forms an utterance beginning with the same sound (a 'b') as the one Esen has just used. The Danish equivalent would have been, "*Den skal være stor.*" I am not claiming that Selma thought about this consciously, I am just raising the possibility that sounds may influence people's choice of words, and in a bilingual situation this may influence "choice of language" as well.

Sacks noted such occurrences and speculated about them, but he also realised that it would be hard to show participants' orientation to such things. Most often speakers make this type of choices without noticing them, and they tend to go unnoticed by co-participants as well.

12. Addressing and attention-getting devices

Aronsson focusses on attention-getting devices and displays of affect in the bilingual data. She notes that "code-switching was a useful resource in the children's expression of affect" (2000: 98).

What Conversation Analysis might add to such observations are situated descriptions of these practices, as in, e.g.:

Extract 2a

```
5 ESEN:    ·hh⇑hnhhh ⇑(la vær og fortæl,)
  eng:                (don't tell)


6 EROL:   Umf:. Esen, Kropa bak,
  eng:    Umf:. Esen, body-at look
          Umf:. Esen, look at the body
```

```
7 SELMA:  Aj >Esen< Oss' (den der),
  eng:    Oh Esen Also (this one)
```

The display of affect and the addressing take place in line 6 and in line 7, with the exclamations "Umf:. Esen" and "*Aj* Esen." If the construction "*krop*a bak" is considered a Turkish construction (in spite of the Danish lexical item "*krop*"), then these turn-initial words can be seen as boundaries between "codes"; Erol switches to Turkish in line 11 and Selma switches back to Danish in line 12. Conversation Analysis can contribute to the characterisation through a detailed attention to what the turns do as "actions" and through an interactional "position" analysis.

Schegloff (1996) suggests that syntactic, topological considerations about positions in clauses and sentences may be supplemented by interactional turn-taking considerations about positions (see also Steensig 2001a; Lindström in prep.). In these terms, the two items at the beginning of lines 11 and 12 are in the "pre-beginning position," a position where it is relevant for speakers to secure their turns and to indicate what type of turn they are about to take. In this position, recipients still have the chance to start speaking, and they can react to the projections or relevances which have been expressed in the pre-beginning. A consideration of interactional positions for items which are used as boundary markers between languages, might contribute to answering the question whether the cooccurrence of attention-getting devices and affect displays on one hand and code-switches on the other is incidental or functionally motivated.

13. The monolingual story-line

Cromdal (2000) discovered that in conversation 801, the participants systematically use Danish when constructing the story-line of the task they are making. This observation is in total alignment with what I have seen in the data.

When it comes to the possible reasons for using a switch to Danish at the onset of a narrative sequence, Cromdal notes that in general "narrative onset involving a code-switch is accomplished *without any discourse markers*" (2000: 58, emphasis added). One of the instances of this is, according to Cromdal, the following, where Esen in line 14 returns to the story in Danish:

Extract 6. [Køgedata:Conv801:retr.11/01:15]

```
1 ESEN:   Hun ringer og be[stiller  ]en [billet,]
  eng:    she calls  and bo[oks      ]a  [ticket  ]
```

```
 2 SELMA:                    [(>°xxx,°<)]   [(°x,°)]

 3 pause: (.)

 4 ESEN:  to billetter ti': [ø:h    ]
   eng:   two tickets   to  [u:h
 5 EROL:                    [Det skr]iver du=
   eng:                      That write you
                             You write that

 6 EROL:  =Esen, me' sort eller grøn eller hva', ·hh
   eng:    Esen  with black or   green or what

 7 ESEN:  °og,°
   eng:    and

 8 EROL:  Det behøver du ikk' skrive nu¿=
   eng:   That need you not write now
          You need not write that now

 9 ESEN:  =Nej.
   eng:    No ((here used as an acceptance token))

10 pause: (0.4)

11 EROL:  (°Nå,¹⁴) Sonra yazar↑sın°¿
   eng:   ( Oh  ) Later you-can-write

12 ESEN?  m,

13 ASIYE: (Ø) [öbür (bunların isi ne oluyor¿)]
   eng:       [the-other (their task what become) ]
             [the other (what are they to do   ) ]
14 ESEN:     [Hun kommer over ti'  biografen]=
   eng:       she comes  over to  the-cinema

15 ESEN:  =køber popco:rn,
   eng:    buys  popcorn
```

Surely, there is no discourse marker in line 14 when Esen comes back to telling her story. However, there is a *prosodic* marking which contributes to showing what she is doing. Her intonation and voice quality in line 14 resembles that of lines 1 and 4 very much. It seems that she links to this other part of the story-line by using the little *og* in line 7, which at that point also ignores Erol's suggestion in lines 5-6, and through using the same tone of voice. Her tone of voice in lines 14, 1 and 4 contrasts with the one she

---

¹⁴ *"godt" ('good')* in original transcript.

uses for a quite different activity (*viz.* accepting Erol's suggestion that she does not write it now) in line 9. It is also a prosodic contrast which makes Esen's line 14 contrast with Erol's line 11 (which is spoken very softly).[15] So, it may be argued that prosodic devices are the most important ones used by Esen to keep her story-line intact and to let it stand out from the surrounding activities. The choice of Danish as a language for doing this is complementary, but it is not used exclusively for this purpose in this extract; in line 9 Esen uses Danish in a different type of activity.[16]

In this case, the detailed analysis of the talk may contribute to our understanding of the interrelationship between code-switching and prosody.

14. Conclusion

In this paper I have explored what Conversation Analysis could do with the Køge Project Conversation 801. I hope to have shown that the attention to interactional particulars which lie at the heart of Conversation Analysis can be of use to the understanding of that part of interaction which is "bilingual" in some way or other.

I have also touched on one aspect where Conversation Analysis did not seem to be able to contribute with anything new, *viz.*, the analysis of the linguistic structure of main verb in Danish + auxiliary verb in Turkish. Conversation Analysis could not say anything about this construction as such, but it could give information about the contexts in which the construction is used.

I have not considered directly the profound methodological problems inherent in using conversation-analytical methodology on data for which the analyst has very little "member's intuition." Conversation Analysis relies heavily on an intuitive feeling for what is going on, a feeling which should not be an unanalysed resource, but which must enter into analysis in order for the analyst to get at the participants' interpretations. To do this with bilingual data, the analyst should ideally belong to the same type of bilingual community as the one being analysed. This is, of course, not always possible. Instead, the analyst should get into profound interaction with members of that bilingual community when trying to analyse. Still, there may be aspects

---

[15] Note that contrary to Turan's transcription (1999:213), I hear lines 13 and 14 as being produced simultaneously. Esen "wins over" Asiye mainly because she persists, she does not seem to "shout her out" at all.

[16] This does not render Cromdal's analysis wrong. His argument is not that Danish is used solely for the story line, but that it can be used as a means, sometimes the only means, of returning to the story line. This is still true, among other things because Esen's Danish suggestion in lines 14-15 contasts with Erol's preceding line 11, which is in Turkish.

which the analyst just does not catch, and this may mean that "non-member" analysts may never get as far with bilingual data as conversation analysts have come with data in their own languages. Still, I believe that Conversation Analysis may have something to offer to the study of bilingual interaction. Some of the things have been shown here, others will appear as conversation analysts start working more with this type of data.

References:

Aronsson, Karin. 2000. 'Address, affect, and audience design in bilingual multiparty talk,' in Anne Holmen & Jens Normann Jørgensen (eds.), *Det er Conversation 801 degil mi? Perspectives on the Bilingualism of Turkish Speaking Children and Adolescents in North Western Europe*, Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, The Køge Series, K7, Copenhagen, pp. 91-100.

Atkinson & Heritage (eds.). 1984. *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Auer, Peter. 1998. '1. Introduction. Bilingual Conversation Revisited,' in Auer (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity*, Routledge, London/New York, pp. 1-24.

Backus, Ad. 2000. 'What kind of talk is alternational codeswitching?' in Anne Holmen & Jens Normann Jørgensen (eds.), *Det er Conversation 801 degil mi? Perspectives on the Bilingualism of Turkish Speaking Children and Adolescents in North Western Europe*, Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, The Køge Series, K7, Copenhagen, 77-90.

Cromdal, Jakob. 2000. 'Creating a monolingual story in bilingual conversation,' in Anne Holmen & Jens Normann Jørgensen (eds.), *Det er Conversation 801 degil mi? Perspectives on the Bilingualism of Turkish Speaking Children and Adolescents in North Western Europe*, Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, The Køge Series, K7, Copenhagen, 57-75.

Heritage, John. 1984. *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*, chapter 8 on 'Conversation Analysis,' Polity Press, Cambridge.

Holmen, Anne & Jens Normann Jørgensen. 2000. 'The interdependence of second language and bilingual development in successively bilingual Turkish-Danish speaking children,' in Anne Holmen & Jens Normann Jørgensen (eds.), *Det er Conversation 801 degil mi? Perspectives on the Bilingualism of Turkish Speaking Children and Adolescents in North Western Europe*, Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, The Køge Series, K7, Copenhagen, 137-155.

Holmen, Anne & Jens Normann Jørgensen (eds.). 2000. *Det er Conversation 801 degil mi? Perspectives on the Bilingualism of Turkish Speaking Children and Adolescents in North Western Europe*, Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, The Køge Series, K7, Copenhagen.

Hutchby, Ian & Robin Wooffitt. 1998. *Conversation Analysis. Principles, Practices and Applications*, Polity Press, Cambridge.

Jefferson, Gail. 1984. 'Notes on some orderlinesses of overlap onset,' in D'Urso & Leonardi, (eds.), *Discourse Analysis and Natural Rhetorics*, CLEUP Editore, Padova, pp. 11-38.

Jefferson, Gail. 1986. 'Notes on 'latency' in overlap onset,' *Human Studies*, 9, 153-183.

Jefferson, Gail. 1989. 'Notes on a possible metric which provides for a 'standard maximum silence' of approximately one second in conversation,' in Roger & Bull (eds.), *Conversation: an Interdisciplinary Perspective*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, pp. 166-96.

Jørgensen, Jens Normann. 1993. 'Children's code-switching in group conversations,' in *European Science Foundation Network on Code-Switching and Language Contact*. Code-Swithcing Summer School, Pavia, 9-12 Sept. 1992, European Science Foundation, Paris, 165-181.

Jørgensen, Jens Normann. 1998. 'Children's acquisition of code-switching for power wielding,' in Auer (ed.), *Code-Switching in Conversation. Language, Interaction and Identity*, Routledge, London/New York, pp. 237-258.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Lindström, Jan. in prep. 'Från satsschema til turschema? Förfältet i fokus' [From sentence schema to turn schema? The front-field in focus'], unpublished manuscript, Helsingfors.

Maegaard, Marie. 1998. 'Sprogvalg i gruppesamtaler,' [Language choice in group conversations], in Møller et al. (eds.), *Tosproget udvikling* [Bilingual Development], Københavnerstudier i tosprogethed, Køgeserien K4, Copenhagen, pp. 21-40.

Møller, Janus. 1998. 'Identitet og ordvalg hos unge piger med tyrkisk-dansk baggrund,' [Identity and lexical choice among young girls with a Turkish-Danish background], in Møller et al (eds.), *Tosproget udvikling* [Bilingual Development], Copenhagen, Københavnerstudier i tosprogethed, Køgeserien K4, Copenhagen, pp. 41-70.

Pomerantz, Anita. 1984a. 'Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes,' in Atkinson & Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 57-101.

Pomerantz, Anita. 1984b. 'Pursuing a response,' in Atkinson & Heritage (eds.), *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 152-163.

Pomerantz, Anita & B. J. Fehr. 1997. 'Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense making practises,' in van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction*, Sage, London, 64-91.

Rampton, Ben. 1995. *Crossing: Language and Ethnicity among Youths*, Longman, London.

Sacks, Harvey. 1987. 'On the preferences for agreement and contiguity in sequences in conversation,' in Button & Lee (eds.), *Talk and Social Organization*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, pp. 54-69.

Sacks, Harvey. 1992a. *Lectures on Conversation*, Vol 1, Blackwell, Oxford UK/Cambridge USA.

Sacks, Harvey. 1992b. *Lectures on Conversation*, Vol. 2, Blackwell, Oxford UK/Cambridge USA.

Sacks, Harvey, Emanuel Schegloff & Gail Jefferson. 1974. 'A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation,' *Language* 50(4), 696-735.

Schegloff, Emanuel. 1987. 'Recycled turn beginnings,' in Button & Lee (eds.), *Talk and Social Organisation*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon PA, pp. 70-85.

Schegloff, Emanuel. 1993. 'Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation,' *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 26(1), 99-128.

Schegloff, Emanuel. 1996. 'Turn organization: one intersection of grammar and interaction,' in Ochs, Schegloff, & Thompson (eds.), *Interaction and grammar*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 52-133.

Schegloff, Emanuel. 2000. 'Overlapping talk and the organization of turn-taking for conversation,' *Language in Society*, 29, 1-63.

Steensig, Jakob. 2000a. 'Notes on some uses of code-switches and other interactional devices in conversation 801,' in Anne Holmen & Jens Normann Jørgensen (eds.), *Det er Conversation 801 degil mi? Perspectives on the Bilingualism of Turkish Speaking Children and Adolescents in North Western Europe*, Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, The Køge Series, K7, Copenhagen, pp. 9-30.

Steensig, Jakob. 2000b. 'CA transcription of conversation 801 Køge Project,' in Anne Holmen & Jens Normann Jørgensen (eds.), *Det er Conversation 801 degil mi? Perspectives on the Bilingualism of Turkish Speaking Children and Adolescents in North Western Europe*, Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, The Køge Series, K7, Copenhagen, pp. 31-56.

Steensig, Jakob. 2001a. *Sprog i virkeligheden: Bidrag til en interactionel lingvistik* [Language in reality: contributions to an interactional linguistics], Aarhus University Press, Århus.

Steensig, Jakob. 2001b. 'Notes on turn construction methods in Danish and Turkish conversations,' in Selting & Couper-Kuhlen (eds.), *Studies in Interactional Linguistics*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, pp. 259-286.

Steensig, Jakob. 2001c. 'Some notes on the use of Conversation Analysis in the study of bilingual interaction,' in Jørgensen (ed.), *Multilingual Behavior in Youth Groups: Scandinavian Studies in the Simultaneous Use of Two or More Languages in Group Conversations among Children and Adolescents*, Copenhagen, Copenhagen Studies of Bilingualism, K11, pp. 55-79.

Terasaki, A. K. 1976. *Pre-announcement Sequences in Conversation*, Irvine CA, Social Science Working Paper 99, School of Social Science, University of California.

Turan, Fadime (ed.) 1999, *A Text Collection of Turkish-Danish Bilingual Grade School Students' Conversations*, Copenhagen Studies in Bilingualism, The Køge Series K6, Copenhagen.

Türker, Emel. 2001. 'Traces of language change in the speech of Turkish youth in Norway,' in Jørgensen (ed.), *Multilingual Behavior in Youth Groups: Scandinavian Studies in the Simultaneous Use of Two or More Languages in Group Conversations among Children and Adolescents*, Copenhagen Studies of Bilingualism, K11, Copenhagen pp. 81-98.

APPENDIX
Transcription conventions in the CA-type transcripts
Adapted version of the Gail Jefferson system, see, e.g., Hutchby & Wooffitt (1998: vi-vii, 73-92), Atkinson & Heritage (eds.) (1984: ix-xvi).

An initial capital letter means that there is "pitch reset" at this point, i.e., it sounds as if a new intonation unit is beginning here.

Square brackets show overlap (beginning and end). Used in both of the overlapping utterances.

Parentheses around parts in the text denotes uncertain hearing. Each 'x' in the parentheses shows one discernable syllable.

Equal marks denote "latching," i.e. that two utterances are said with no silence between them. Placed at both the end of the previous and beginning of the next of the "latched" utterances. Silence duration is shown within parentheses in approximated tenths of seconds. '(.)' denotes a silence shorter that (0.3).

Punctuation marks are used to denote intonation in a rough manner along the following lines: commas denote "even intonation"; full stops "fall to low"; question marks "rising intonation"; and inverted question marks rise but not to a high level." Arrows (up and down) indicate unusually high or low tone on the following syllable.

Underscoring denotes stress. The more underscore, the more distinct the stress. Colons show that the sound before the colon is lengthened (non-phonemic lengthening only). Combination of underscore and colons: If the letter is underscored, there is a falling intonation on the syllable; if the colon is underscored, there is a rising intonation on the syllable. If both letter and colon are underscored, the tone on the syllable is even (but stressed).

Degree signs '°' surround parts which are spoken with low volume. Capital letters (other than just the first) denote high volume.

Laughter is written as it sounds (as much as possible). The use of 'hh' in words shows breathiness in the word.

Hyphens '-' denote a cut off in phonation, often it is a glottal stop.

A flying full stop '·' before a word or a sound shows that the word/sound is spoken on the inbreath.

Danish parts are written in italics. Turkish parts, and words or sounds which cannot be attributed to one or the other language, are written with normal letters. Below each line of talk there is an English word-by-word or morpheme-by-morpheme glossing. In cases where this glossing is deemed unintelligible, a further line is added with a more intelligible English interpretation.